



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

devotion, and held by Protestants generally to be a groundless and dangerous superstition.

The Church of Rome understands by reliques not only the bodies or parts of the bodies of the saints, but any of those things which belonged to them, such as St. Francis's girdle and the like, which are considered blessed, as having touched their sanctified bodies, and worthy of religious veneration and honour. The Council of Trent, not only defends the Church's former practices towards reliques and confirms the worship of them, but curses those who shall dare to say that such worship is unlawful. The decree, so far as it relates to this subject, is as follows:—

"The Holy Synod enjoining on all bishops and others sustaining the office and charge of teaching, that they especially instruct the faithful diligently touching . . . the honor paid to reliques."

Also, that the holy bodies of holy martyrs, and of others now living with Christ, are to be venerated by the faithful; through which bodies many benefits are bestowed by God on man; so that they who affirm that veneration and honour are not due to the reliques of saints; or that those and other sacred monuments are uselessly honoured by the faithful; and that the places dedicated to the memories of the saints are vainly visited for the purpose of obtaining their wish, are wholly to be condemned, as the Church has already long since condemned, and doth now also condemn them." (Sess. 25, 3 Dec., 1563.)

What we propose at present to enquire is whether this worship of reliques has any foundation in Holy Scripture, which our readers will observe is always the first question in our consideration, though we do not avoid referring afterwards to the testimony of the early Fathers, as the best witnesses of what was handed down by tradition from the time of our Lord and his Apostles.

Cardinal Bellarmine relies upon several texts of Scripture in favour of such worship.* We shall examine them one by one.

The first is Exodus xiii. 19.—"And Moses took the bones of Joseph with him, for he had strictly sworn the Children of Israel, saying, God will surely visit you: and ye shall carry up my bones away hence with you." If this text had proceeded to tell us that Joseph's bones were carried with them, in order to the Children of Israel receiving benefits or blessings from them, or making them the objects of religious honour, or with a view to having recourse to them for obtaining aid in cases of difficulty or distress, we would, of course, admit that it would afford a striking support of the present practice of the Church of Rome, but not one of these things is intimated or hinted at in the text, which contains merely a simple narrative of a matter of fact—viz., that when the Children of Israel left the land of Egypt, to seek the Land of Promise, according to God's command, Moses obeyed the express injunction of Joseph, that his bones should be removed also. What the object of Joseph was in this matter is not stated by the sacred historian; but we think it quite obvious there is no similarity at all between a man's body, at his own request, being carried into another country to be buried with his kindred, in the country his brethren should possess, and the present practice of the Church of Rome of separating the remains of their saints, and carrying one part of a saint's body to this church and another part to another church—putting them up in glass-cases and shrines—making solemn processions with them on occasions of solemnities, and never burying them at all. Joseph's bones were put together into a coffin, in Egypt, and, on the departure of the Israelites thence, were carried to the Land of Canaan, to be buried there with his father, in accordance with a solemn oath made to him, at his own desire, while alive; and that is all that can be drawn from this passage of Exodus, which affords no countenance to the practices it is cited to defend.

The next passage is from Deuteronomy xxxiv. 6, where it is said of God, that "he buried him (Moses) in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Beth-peor; but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day."

How Cardinal Bellarmine or any man of common reason could consider this text favourable to religious worship of reliques, we are at a loss to conceive; for, so far as any inference can be drawn from it, it appears clearly against it; and the common interpretation of the passage, even among the Jewish doctors, as well as others, is the very natural one, that God purposely hid the body of Moses, so that "no man knoweth of his sepulchre to this day," lest the people of Israel should, out of their great love and veneration to their great deliverer from Egyptian bondage, have been led away, at sometime or other, to worship his remains with superstitious veneration. So palpable indeed is this, that Bellarmine himself, in chap. iv., p. 308, admits, that it is probable (as stated by St. Chrysostom in Hom. 5, in Matthew) that

the sepulchre of Moses was concealed, lest he should be worshipped by the Jews as God, and refers to the case of the brazen serpent which Hezekiah afterwards destroyed, because the people sacrificed or burned incense to it.—2 Kings ch. 18, as a proof that the danger was a real one, though while Moses was living, there was no fear of the people either worshipping him or the serpent, he being always at hand daily to tell them that there was but one true God, and that he (Moses) was only his servant, and the brazen serpent, by looking on which they were cured, was not that God, but a symbol only.

Bellarmino's next Scripture proof is taken from 2 Kings xiii. 21, which contains an account (and the only one in the whole Bible) of an extraordinary miracle done by the Almighty in honour of the bones of a prophet—the prophet Elisha. "And it came to pass as they were burying a man, that behold they spied a band of men, and they cast the man into the sepulchre of Elisha; and when the man was cast down, and touched the bones of Elisha, he revived and stood upon his feet." Of course we neither doubt the miracle, nor that God honoured the bones of his prophet Elisha by it, but we neither meet with one word of any honour done or commanded to Elisha's bones in consequence of this miracle, nor do we find that they were taken up and enshrined by the Israelites, nor any processions made to them in order to receive any benefits from them, notwithstanding so great a miracle as that of restoring a dead man to life, which surely could not have failed to be recorded, if any such things had taken place.

The next text cited is 2 Kings xxiii. 16, 17, where Josiah is described as breaking up the sepulchres, and burning the bones of the false prophets upon an idolatrous altar, yet commanding the bones of the true prophet not to be moved, but preserved entire, when the men of the city told him it was the sepulchre of the "man of God which came from Judah, and proclaimed these things that thou hast done against the altar of Bethel." And he said, "let him alone, let no man move his bones." What does this prove but that the good king Josiah so respected the remains of the prophet, that he would not let him be disturbed, but left quietly in his grave: which seems to be a curious passage to be adduced by them, who, instead of letting the bodies of good men rest in peace in their graves, have, in honour of them, been in the habit of digging them up, and then, instead of burying them together again to rest, turn them to pecuniary profit, placing an arm here, and a leg there, and in another place a piece of the skull, and carrying them in procession on occasions from one place to another, pretending that they have some signal virtue in them to confer benefits or arrest misfortunes, which, if King Josiah had thought, he would probably have acted similarly, instead of merely ordering that the prophets' bones should be left undisturbed; which command was obeyed, for the same historian adds—"So they let his bones alone with the bones of the prophet that came out of Samaria."

The only remaining text cited by Bellarmine from the Old Testament is Isaiah xi. 10. Speaking of the Messiah Isaiah says, "In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people, to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious." Bellarmine here translates the word (rest) *sepulchre*, as does the Douay version, and supposing that *sepulchre* were the correct translation, which we think it clearly is not,* it never could mean that the *sepulchre of stone* in which Christ lay should be worshipped, but merely by a figurative expression was obviously meant to convey that Christ's victory over the grave would be glorious, and the cause of salvation and deliverance from the power of death and the grave to the Gentiles who should believe in Him.

That none of these texts from the Old Testament prove that the worshipping of reliques is proper or justifiable we think the candid reader will allow. Whether the learned Cardinal is more successful in the authorities he has cited from the New Testament we hope to be able to consider in our next number.

THE TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. XIII.

"Well, Jem, did you get the book about the Scapular?"
"Deed then I did, Pat, and here it is," said Jem, taking the book out of his pocket, as they met on the road.

"Well, and is it like the Bible at all?" said Pat.

"Why then, said Jem, 'if there's two books in the world that isn't like each other one bit, it's this book and the Bible; and more forely, if this book is true, I don't see what call there is for the Bible at all; for sure enough, it's a deal easier to be saved by this book and the Blessed Virgin, than it is to be saved by Jesus Christ and the Bible—that is, barring it isn't all a lie about the Scapular. But I'm thinking, if the Bible is true, it will go hard with poor Judy and them that trusts in this book."

"Well, what is it all about?" said Pat.

* The Hebrew word, which Bellarmine, following the vulgate, translates "sepulchre" is *מִקְבָּר*. This word occurs 21 times in the Old Testament. In 15 of these passages it is translated by the vulgate "requies," or rest; and in no other passage, except this one of Isaiah xi. 10, do they render it "sepulchre." Such a translation, indeed, would make sheer nonsense of some of the texts in which the word occurs. Take, for example, Psalm cxxii (cxxx Douay) in the 8th verse, "Arise, O Lord, into thy 'sepulchre.' thou and the ark which thou hast sanctified;" or, again, the 14th verse of the same Psalm, "This is my 'sepulchre' for ever and ever; here will I dwell, for I have chosen it." We conclude, therefore, that the proper translation of Isaiah xi. 10 is that of the authorized version—"His rest shall be glorious."

"Why, first and foremost," said Jem, "it tells us how the order of Carmelites was founded by Elijah the prophet, on Mount Carmel; and it tells how he was upon the mountain nine hundred years and more before our Saviour was born, and he seen a little cloud as big as his hand coming up out of the sea, and that was the Blessed Virgin herself! no less, and so then he set up the Carmelites in honour of her, and it tells the place in the Bible where to find it, (3rd Book of Kings, ch. xviii., v. 42, &c., Douay Bible; 1st Book, authorized version), and sure enough, when I went to look for it, Elijah was there, and saw the little cloud, but not one word good or bad about the Blessed Virgin, nor the order of Carmelites neither."

"Well, well," said Pat, "was these Carmelites nine-hundred years before our Saviour was born, and were they Christians then?"

"Why the book makes it out they're that old," said Jem; "and that they took up with the Blessed Virgin as soon as she was born, and that she was mighty fond of them, and gave them the Scapular herself. But 'deed she was in no hurry to give it to them, for she didn't give it to 'em for more nor twelve hundred years after that again!"

"And how could that be, at all, at all," said Pat; "sure she must have been dead before that, anyway."

"Why, here's the story," said Jem, (page 31). "There was one Simon Stock, that lived in England, and a quare way he got his name, for he ran away into the woods when he was twelve years old, and lived in a hollow tree for twenty years, and he lived on the roots he scraped up, only when a dog brought him bread in his mouth on the festival days; and the Blessed Virgin would be coming to him often; and it so fell out that was the time that the Carmelites was turned out of Mount Carmel. So the Blessed Virgin told one day they were coming that way, and that he'd be a Carmelite; and so when they come, he joined them, and was the greatest man that ever they had."

"Well, and did she give him the Scapular then," said Pat.

"Not that time," said Jem; but when he was near dying, and thinking what would the Carmelites do without him, he went to the Blessed Virgin and told her all about it, and how all the Popes had confirmed the order, and all they had done for it. And so one day she come to him, just dressed the way she would be in heaven, and thousands of angels with her, and the Scapular ready in her hand; and she says to him, see, here's the very words in the book, (p. 34), 'Receive, most beloved son (says she) the Scapular of thy order, a sign of my confraternity, a privilege both to thee and to all Carmelites, in which he that dieth shall not suffer eternal fire; behold the sign of salvation, a safeguard in danger, the covenant of peace and everlasting alliance.' And then she just gives it into his hand, and was gone in a minute; and see, here's the very day, and it marked, the 16th of July 1251."

"Well, I wonder did all that happen," says Pat.

"Well, I'm thinking," said Jem, "if the Blessed Virgin was so fond of the Carmelites for 1250 years before, and if the scapular was so good for them, would she never give it to them before? Why wouldn't she give it to them when she was visiting them so often on Mount Carmel, at the time when our blessed Saviour was born? Why would she leave them without it so long, and they so fond of her, and she so fond of them?"

"There's reason in that any way," said Pat; "and howsoever it isn't the ould religion. Why, sure, the scapular isn't more nor six hundred years old yet, even by the book's story; and don't the Catholics cry out on the Protestants, because everything in their religion isn't as old as the apostles?"

"Well," says Jem, "I think there's a better way still to see if the story is true."

"And how's that?" said Pat.

"Why," said Jem, "just to see how we are to be saved by the scapular, and how that fits with our being saved by Jesus Christ the way the Bible tells us; for if the two doesn't fit, its reason that only one of them can be true."

"Well, I'll stand to that," said Pat, "and how does the book say the scapular saves us?"

"Why, first of all," said Jem, "the book says it is a grand thing for people to be joined in societies, because then every one in the society gets a share in all the prayers, and sacrifices, fastings, alms, and mortifications, and of all the good works of all the rest." (Preface, p. 1.)

And then Pat scratched his head for a minute, and said he, "and whose the gainer by that I wonder, or whose the loser? why there won't be more good works among them after all; and how will they divide? If every man gets his own (and that's the fairest) I don't see the gain at all. And if they get share and share alike, why them that does the most is the losers; and them that does nothing is the gainers. Sure enough there was short commons here in the famine; but if every one, big and little in the parish, had brought all they had together to eat it at worst, sure it wouldn't go farther? And if all the boys in the parish was working at task work, and all in under one, to divide all the earnings among them, I'm thinking maybe its less work would be done, for all the lazy fellows would be saving themselves, to get their share of the work, and they doing nothing. So I don't see the good of clubbing all together no ways."

"Well, that's like enough, Pat," said Jem, "I don't see no great good in it so far; but then, there's more in it still: sure the book says that Pope Clement VII. has given the

* Card. Bellarmine, de Reliq. Sanct. l. 2. c. 3. tom. ii. p. 304, Colon. Agrippi 1615.

† Bellarmine himself well knew this, for being pressed with the difficulty that many of the pretended reliques of saints were and must be supposititious, because so many reliques of the same kind are found, that either the same saint must have had many bodies, or many of the reliques must be false (p. 303) he replies, that parts of the same bodies were in various places, but the whole was named from the part—as St. Basil writes in his oration on the Forty Martyrs, who were then spoken of as whole (dot) in various cities, because each city had a part of them; and as Theodoret also, in his Eighth Book de Martyribus, says, "the bodies of martyrs were rarely found whole in any one monument, but are divided, and distributed in various places. (p. 300.)"

Scapularians a share of all the pious actions which are done throughout the whole church of God (page 46), and wouldn't that be making more for the Scapularians anyway?"

"And, mercy on us," says Pat, "what right has the Pope to take their good works off them that does them, to give them all to the Scapularians? Why, if I'd stint the childer to give the bit to a poor creature on the road, for the love of God, what right has the Pope to take that off me to give it to them that never done it? Sure I'm not the fool to think the Pope can do that, or that God Almighty will let him handle us that sort."

"Nor I, neither, Pat," said Jem, "for doesn't the Bible say that every man 'must appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every man may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad' (2 Cor. v. 5-10); and, sure, how can the Pope go again that?"

"Well, now," said Pat, "I mind a story I was reading, in St. Matthew's Gospel, a Sunday, and there was ten virgins that was going out to meet the Bridegroom (and that was the Lord himself), and they had to fetch lamps with them, for belike it was night, and there was five of them had no oil for their lamps, and, the creatures, they just wanted to have all in common, but the wise ones wouldn't agree to that at all, for they said they hadn't enough to be doing that with; so them that had no oil didn't get in at all, and Jesus Christ said that's just the way it would be when he'd be coming in glory; so it's plain that what's borrowed won't stand then, and isn't that enough for that?"

"Well, I think it is, Pat," said Jem, "and so we'll go on a bit, for there's more in it yet. Sure here's a chapter to say that them that dies in the scapular will never suffer hell fire; and the quare proof the book gives of it, too, for see what it says here (p. 48)—'In the city of Quarena, during the procession of the holy scapular, which is made on the third Sunday of every month, the devils were heard to execrate the holy scapular with many howlings and outcries, lamenting themselves that, by means of this sacred habit of the Blessed Virgin, the gates of hell were shut to many persons.'"

"And does it mean that them that dies with the scapular on will never go to hell, if they were ever so bad?" said Pat.

"Well them's the words that the Book says the Blessed Virgin spoke to Simon Stock, 'in which he that dieth shall not suffer eternal fire,' p. 34, said Jem; but still the book won't stand to it all out; for it says, 'it only means that if any one that dies with the Scapular on does go to hell, it will be his own fault, because God did enough for him.' (p. 48 and 49.)"

"Well, and wasn't that true for 1250 years before there was a Scapular at all," said Pat, "and isn't it true now to them that never saw a Scapular? but I doubt poor Judy doesn't take it that way."

"Well," said Jem, "here's a whole chapter about what Judy said," that the Blessed Virgin would go down to Purgatory to take out the Scapularians the very Saturday after they die. And, well, it turns out that that isn't in what the Blessed Virgin said to Simon Stock at all; but it was the Popes done that; and here the book gives us a list of five Popes, no less, that all laid it on the Blessed Virgin to do that same, (p. 50), and what do you think of that Pat?"

"Why then, Jem," said Pat, "I'd think it a great pity that ever they'd die at all, barring of a Friday night."

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "here's more; here's a whole chapter of all the indulgences that ever the Popes gave to the Carmelites, for the foolishness things that ever you read. Sure here's an indulgence of three years to all Christians, let alone Carmelites, for every time they call the Carmelites 'the order of the Blessed Virgin Mary;' now isn't that easy got?"

"Well, salvation's cheap by the Scapular anyway," said Pat.

"I'm thinking it's not, Pat," said Jem, "for if the Bible's true, the Scapular will, may be, cost their souls to them that trusts in it."

"And is there any more in it?" said Pat.

"Deed is there," said Jem, "sure here's a whole chapter, to show that the Scapular is good against 'devils, and fire, and water, and wild beasts, and sickness, and witchcrafts, and danger in child-bed, and pistol shots and many other ill accidents (p. 71.); and here's stories for them all: first and foremost, here's a story of a man that was shot with a pistol and two bullets in it, and the minute he was shot he just felt the two bullets fall down into his breeches; and when he got home, he found they just hit on the Scapular."

"Stop a bit, Jem," said Pat, "wouldn't that be the fine thing for Mr. Collins, the agent, that's shot at so often; I'm thinking if that was true, he'd be a Scapularian himself."

"That would be the thing for the agents, Pat," said Jem, "but here's more stories for you; here's a poor fellow that was kept alive by the Scapular for four hours after the whole heart was shot out of him by a cannon ball; and sure it was the pity that he died at all; and here's a man got out of the sea by it, and here's a great fire put out by it."

"Well, that won't do anyway," said Pat, "didn't I know Peter Brady that took his family off to America, and weren't they all Scapularians, and didn't the ship take

fire before they got out of Liverpool, and wasn't there both fire and water there to try the Scapular on, and weren't they all drowned?"

"I mind that well, too, Pat," said Jem, "and, sure enough, it did them little good, the creatures."

"But what have the Scapularians to do for all this?" said Pat.

"Why, just not one haporth, but only to wear the Scapular on their backs, for it won't do no good at all if its wore on the breast; (p. 50), sure here it is, 'it sufficeth that the Scapular be received lawfully, and worn devoutly, without any other obligation' (p. 60); only if they want to get out of Purgatory on the first Saturday, they must fast on Wednesdays, or else say the office of the Blessed Virgin, which they please; but they must do neither the one nor the other to be kept out of hell."

"Well, isn't it the poor thing that creatures like Judy should be striving to get salvation by the Scapular, and not knowing nor thinking about the blood of Jesus Christ," said Pat; "and isn't it the poor thing that the clergy has never one word to say agin' books like that, and if a Bible turns up afore them, they're ready to hunt it like a mad dog; surely there's something wanting to set it right."

"And with all, Pat," said Jem, "there's something in the Scapular itself that won't fit father John."

"And what's that, Jem?" said Pat.

"Here it is, Pat," said Jem, "'those that visit our churches (that's the Carmelite churches), and pray for the ordinary necessities, may free a soul out of Purgatory every Wednesday throughout the whole year,' and where's the call for buying masses if that's true?"

"Well," said Pat, "if the people once come to take to that plan, isn't it father John that will hunt the Scapular out of the parish?"

"It might be better nor hunting the readers," said Jem. So Pat and Jem parted for that night.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have to apologise to PHILAETHES and several other correspondents for postponing the insertion of their communications, some of which are already in type, but omitted necessarily for want of space.

It letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

We would request our valued correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JUNE, 1853.

WE have been so much occupied hitherto in our efforts to induce our fellow-countrymen to discuss, in a more calm and amicable spirit, the differences existing between them in religious matters, that, perhaps, we may have appeared to some of our readers as applying ourselves too much to the mere *intellect*, and too little to the *heart*, and to be more anxious to disprove error, than directly to advocate truth. We can assure our readers, however, that the notion of the affections being out of place in religion is not one that we recognize as a sound one. We are fully persuaded that those who would exclude from the service of religion so important a part of the composition of man as his feelings and affections, have wholly mistaken the character of Christianity, undervalue her strength, and are ignorant of her true power. It is, we strongly feel, the peculiar glory and the special office of Christianity to bring all the faculties of our nature into their just subordination and dependence, and restore the whole man, complete in all his functions and faculties, of heart as well as understanding, to the service and glory of God.

It was, therefore, with a feeling rather of pleasure than surprise, that we received a letter, which our readers will find in another column, signed DERMOT M'MANUS, in which he accuses us of prudently keeping clear of the arguments derivable from the *feelings*, or, as he calls them, the *internal convictions* of Roman Catholics that their religion is true. The importance of the subject may justify us in calling especial attention to this letter as well as to what we shall say in reply to it, though, we confess, we are surprised that a gentleman so candid and fair-minded, as we take Mr. M'MANUS to be, should have hazarded a representation of our religious opinions so utterly erroneous, so wholly unlike the real state of the case as that contained in his letter. We are still more surprised at his strange assumption, that *we ourselves must allow* the character of the system which we have always supported is one unable to make any solid impression on the heart and affections. So far from allowing this, we earnestly maintain that those grand truths of the Gospel of the grace of God, which we seek and have always sought, to preserve in their simplicity and integrity, free from all human additions and corruptions, are exactly those most calculated in their own nature, and most effectual, as proved by experience, to stir up the heart of the believer to its inmost depths, and influence, and purify while they influence, his noblest affections and highest energies.

Without anticipating the argument of our correspondent, we would avail ourselves of this opportunity of stating distinctly the class of truths we refer to. They are happily those on which all pious and real Christians, of whatever creed, may, we hope, agree, and which centre on the person of God our Saviour. The Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ—his true humanity—his love for men prompting him to lay down his life for their sakes—the offering of his atoning blood in reconciling sinners to God—the free pardon offered to all who have faith in that precious blood, and are obedient to the truth—the sanctifying and consoling influences of God the Spirit—together with the sacramental and other means of grace which the Christian has provided for him in what we hold to be the church of Christ, and to the right and faithful use of which He has promised his blessing—these are some of the glorious truths of God which we believe and cling to—which the Apostles believed—which the ancient Fathers believed—which the noble army of martyrs believed—which were not only assented to by their understanding, but which were received into their heart, and which were found mighty, as principles of action, in moulding them to habits of piety and virtue. Must these truths have lost their power and become inoperative, when believed by us, because we are unable to hold, along with these doctrines, others which we are persuaded we can prove to be of human invention? Can we have no love to our adorable Saviour and Redeemer, our merciful High Priest and Mediator, because we refuse to share his work and merits with any creature, however exalted, or to lavish on such a created being that tribute of devout affection which we believe to be due to God alone? We think our readers will see that our correspondent has done us an injustice in this matter—that there is nothing in the doctrines which we hold (and the greater part of which, be it observed, we hold in common with Roman Catholics themselves), which can justify the charge of ours being a cold, lifeless creed. It is possible that many Roman Catholics do not know that we have in the Church of England a ritual also, sublime in its devout simplicity, and breathing the very spirit, and often the very language, of primitive piety? Were they also to become intimately acquainted with the sacred treasure of the written Word of